



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,334	10/18/2000	Aninda Dasgupta	US 000013	5217

24737 7590 09/26/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/691,334

Applicant(s)

DASGUPTA, ANINDA

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims **1, 2, 7, 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105).

As to claim 1, Rajan teaches digital audio device (Digital Audio-Visual Council/ digital video broadcast, page 1, ln 5-20/audio and / or video at the media player, page 4, ln 1-28/Video media player 330, col 3, ln 1-23/ Fig. 3 / col 37, ln 1-14), playback (playback, col 35, ln 1-25), an external interface capable (an external source, col 4, ln 1-28), processing system (computer program code, col 4, ln 1-28), user interface application program (the API, col 4, ln 1-28/ col 35-25col 37, ln 1-25), a memory (memory 322, col16, ln 1-26), a reverse DAPD application programming interface (API)(the API control stopping, suspending and resuming ... , col 35, ln 1-25), user interface(user interface 325, Fig 3/ col 16, ln 1-26), monitor screen(a video monitor, col 16, ln 1- 26).

Rajan does not teach display on a monitor screen. However, Rodesch teaches display on the monitor (col 22, ln 15-26).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching Rodesch to Rajan in order to receive video output signal therefrom and to produce video displays corresponding thereto.

As to claim 2, Rodesch teaches executable instruction (the presentation function, col 4, ln 1-28), user interface application program (a user remote control, col 4, ln 1-28).

Art Unit: 2126

As to the processing system of claim 7, refer to the rejection of claim 1. Further, Rajan teaches playing audio file (media player for audio, video and other data, col 4, ln 1-28).

As to the processing system of claim 8, see the rejection of claim 2.

2. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105) and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

As to claim 3, Rajan teaches first data (stream of audio and / or video, col 37, in 1-15).

Rajan does not explicit teach the term a manufacture of said digital audio playback device. However, APA teaches manufactures of digital audio playback devices (page 4, ln 4-17).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of APA to Rajan in order to communicate and control the digital audio playback device over the PC connection.

As to claim 4, Rajan does not explicit teach the portion. However, APA teaches look and feel (page 4, ln 18-24).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of APA to Rajan in order to provide a typical user application, which typically operates any of several digital audio playback devices in the market.

As to the processing system of claim 9, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to the processing system of claim 10, see the rejection of claim 4.

As to the method of claim 15, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to the method of claim 16, 17, see the rejection of claim 4.

3. Claims **5, 6, 11, 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105) and further in view of Hunt (US. Patent 6,442, 658 B1).

As to claim 5, Rajan does not teach graphic file. However, Hunt teaches animated graphics (col 1, ln 14-23)/ JPEG graphic 210 (col 7, ln 1-53).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Hunt to Rajan in order to deliver to the user a variety of files on multimedia works.

As to claim 6, Rajan does not teach a URL associated with an Internet web site. However, Hunt teaches Internet web page (col 1, ln 14-23).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Hunt to Rajan in order to deliver to the user a variety of files on multimedia works.

As to the processing system of claim 11, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to the processing system of claim 12, see the rejection of claim 6.

4. Claim **13** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver).

As to claim 13, APA teaches digital audio playback device (digital audio playback devices, page 5, ln 5-23/ page 4, ln 1-25), user interface application program (user interface, page

Art Unit: 2126

5, ln 5-23/ page 4, ln 1-25), a DAPD API (API, page 5, ln 5-23/ page 4, ln 1-25), displaying (displaying, page 2, ln 20-24).

APA does not teach the connected processing system, a monitor screen. However, Rajan teaches an external source (col 4, ln 1-28), a video monitor, col 16, and ln 1- 26).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Rajan to APA in order to have a simple API for control of the presentation of different broadcast services, to enable playing back media and to control the playback and to display the output audio signal to a video monitor.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) and further in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105).

As to the method of claim 14, see the rejection of claim 2.

6. Claims 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105) and further in view of Hunt (US. Patent 6,442, 658 B1).

As to the method of claim 18, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to the method of claim 19, see the rejection of claim 6.

7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) and further in view of Roland Leins et al (Tivoli Storage Manager Windows 2000).

As to computer executable of claim 20, refer to the rejection of claim 13. Further APA does not teach a removable storage medium. However, Leins teach the removable storage (sec: 8.2.3).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Leins to APA in order to provide a single set of API function for accessing a removable media.

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) and further in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105) and further in view of Leins et al (Tivoli Storage Manager Windows 2000).

As to the computer-executable instruction of claim 21, see the rejection of claim 2.

9. Claims 22, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan et al (Stream Media Control and Synchronization Application Program Interface (API) for a Digital Television Receiver) in view of Rodesch et al (US. Patent 4,422,105) and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Leins et al (Tivoli Storage Manager Windows 2000).

As to computer executable of claim 22, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to computer executable of claim 23, 24, see the rejection of claim 4.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Art Unit: 2126

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

LeChi Truong
September 17, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JF', written over a light gray grid background.

**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**